

REFLECTIONS
ON A
PAPER,

Pretending to be

An Apology

FOR THE
FAILURES

CHARGED ON
Mr. WALKER'S Account
OF THE

SIEGE
OF
London-Derry.

LONDON:

Printed for *Robert Clavel, and Ralph Simpson*, in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard. MDCLXXXIX.

EXPOSITIONS

OF A

NEW

OF THE

AN Apology

PAULI ERES

OF THE

THE NEW L.A.S. ADOPTED

OF THE

SIEGE

OF

London-Derry

OF THE

Printed for Robert Child and John W. P. Child
at the Press of the W.D. & H.O. Wills

*Reflections on a Paper, pretending to be An
Apology for the Failures charged on Mr.
Walker's Account of the Siege of London-
Derry.*

I Have had a great Conflict with my self, whether I should mispend an Hour in scribbling an Animadversion upon a trifling Pamphlet, lately set out, under the Pretext of *an Apology for the Failures in Mr. Walker's Account of the Siege of London-Derry*: Which certainly is an im-methodical Rhapsody of Vapor, Banter, Fallacy, and Equivocations: a Thing that deserves no *Consideration*, and needs no *Answer*. But lest the Author may be hardened in his Mispositions, and fancy himself in the Right, if no Man tells him he is in the wrong; I resolve to speak my Opinion of it, and do solemnly protest, that I do not attempt it out of a Purpose to vindicate Mr. *Walker* (whose Reputation would suffer a disparagement, by the Necessity of a Plea) but to interpose for the Honour of the King, the Privy Council, the Chief Ministers of State, the Church of *England*, and the Bishops; who are all maliciously, rudely, ir-rationally (but very bluntly) reflected on in a Piece of in-coherent Stuff, the Contexture whereof is as idle, and impertinent, as the Style is flat, and rustic.

The Gentleman that writ it, out of a vain Ostentation, that so complete a Treatise could not be believed to be the Issue of one Mans Brains, avows it to be the Result of a Club of Wits (as the Heathen Gods were said to piss in a Urinal, for the Production of one poor Brat) and fortifies

his Sentiments by the Majority of a *Vote*, or consent of a *Verdict*. But I am unwilling to think, that those, whom he boasts to be his Party, should be guilty of so much Imprudence, and so little *Candor*; while with a malicious Craft he insinuates a disingenuous Design in the Writer of that Account to eclipse the Honour of the *Northern Scots*, so formidable to the *Papists*, and to bury their Memory in the Grave of perpetual Oblivion.

He proceeds with a Jesuitical Wheedle, and secretly wounds the Credit of *Mr. Walker*, while he pretends to enumerate his Praises; and with a phlegmatic Allusion to *Kilmore-Boom*, concludes the Paragraph with an empty and abrupt period.

And now having named his Text, and made a smart Distinction between *Mr. Walker* and the *Colonel*, he learnedly divides it into two Parts, a Position, and a Supposition; with great Charity absolving the *Colonel* from the Crime of a *misrepresentation*; and as spitefully derogating from his Sufficiency, as standing in Need of a Co-adjutor to compose an ordinary Narrative. To inforce these Assertions, he offers several Arguments, which he calls Evincing.

And, first, he very civilly gives the Lye to the whole Series of the Narrative, and plainly intimates the Author to be ignorant in the *Laws of History*, and destitute of the two prime Qualifications of an Historian, *Veracity*, and *Credibility*. A bold Stroke! But with the Readers Patience, I shall turn the Point upon the Aggressor, and make it appear, how little he retains of that Vertue, which he requires in others.

Secondly, He suggests an Account from his Correspondents in *Scotland*, and some remoter Parts of *England*, of some occasional Discourses made by *Colonel Walker*, in plain Contradiction to the Narrative, which passeth under the Name of *Mr. Walker*. The Credit of this Argument lies at the Mercy of the Reader, and it is obvious to every Man of Sense, that this may be an intire Fiction in the Reporter;

or if he ever did receive such Intelligence; it is not impossible such good Men may at some Times mistake themselves, and assert such Things to be said or done; which at such a Distance no Man will undertake the Charge, or Trouble, to confute; and which perhaps they would be shy to aver upon Oath in Answer to a Bill in Chancery. But *de non apparentibus, & non existentibus eadem est Ratio*; the Evidence of an *Anonymus* will pass secure from Challenge, or Exceptions, but will make no Impression upon Judge, or Jury, who always demand a Declaration from the Witnesses to be *Viva Voce*.

The third Argument is a fine Invention to advance the Humor of writing Gazetts and Weekly Occurrences, beyond the Credit of an orderly Story, to give an Account of the Passages of this Week, without a Retrospect to what was done in the last. If no Man must give an History of *Transactions*, whereof he was *neither Spectator, nor Actor*; we must rest content with the Annals already Printed; no Man must presume to say what was done last Year; nor attempt to Write of Things done in the Days of *Charles I.* who was born in the Times of *Charles II.* and unless he had the good Luck to go over into *Holland* in 1687, and return into *England* with the *Prince of Orange* in 1688, he must not offer to tell what has been done by *King William* in 1689. But what? Would they have Mr. *Walker* bluntly fall upon the *Siege of London-Derry*, without taking Notice, how it escaped being in the Irish hands? Does he not mention it in his Narrative as a necessary *Preliminary* for the better understanding the Procedure of Affairs there, to know the Rise, and Occasion of them? Must his Discourse only be denied the Decency of a Preface, or Introduction? And tho during the first three *Months* (which the Gentleman upon meer Hear-say calls *four*) Mr. *Walker* was not present in *London-Derry*, yet after his Arrival there he made a particular and strict Inquiry, and industriously consulted those

those Persons since in London, who were best qualified to give him a full Account of all Proceedings in that Interval, and with much more Advantage of Truth, and Certainty, than he that has snarl'd at it, and was neither present at the first shutting the Gates, nor resident afterwards. So that I am forced (against the Rules of good Breeding) to make this asseveration, That he has not dealt truly, and faithfully.

In the fourth Argument the *Apologist* discovers himself to be a Stranger to the Transactions in *London-Derry*, and runs into the same Error, which he imputes to Mr. *Walker*, relating Matters, whereof he was no *Spectator*, and wherein he was no *Actor*. For tho' *Counsellor Cairns* might be very active in forming the Multitude into Companies, (during the three Days he stayed in *London-Derry*, after the Gates were shut) yet neither he, nor any Man else, did, or at that Time durst presume to declare for the Prince of Orange (whatsoever their Inclinations might be.) Besides that it had not been proper for him to do such a Thing, without the Allowance or Leave of another Person, whom the Inhabitants of the Place unanimously chose for their Governour, and submitted to his Orders without Reluctancy.

Ne savi, magne Sacerdos. In the fifth Argument the *Apologist* seems to be a little transported with Indignation, and arraigns the Narrative for a partial Omission of the Honor, and Praises due to the valiant *Actors* in that memorable Siege. But the Author of it did not intend to write a Panegyric, he aim'd at no more than a naked Recital, and History of matters of Fact, tho' indeed it is rather a Collection of Notes and Minutes, than a full and continued Story; and for that reason it only mentions the Names of Persons as they occur, in relating of the Passages, without blazoning the Gallantry of their particular Actions: and in that brief manner, without Prolixity, it has given an honorable Character of Colonel *Baker*, p. 34. and highly applauded

plauded the Behaviour both of Officers and Men, in the same Page. But what the Caviller means by an *imperfect Journal* (now in London) whence 'tis borrow'd, he may perhaps know, for my part I do not.

I look upon the sixth Argument, as a malignant Fardle of Mutiny, and an uncharitable Crotchet to ferment a Nation and a Party into Discontent, saying, That *the Narrative was contrived under the Conduct of mortal Prejudice against the Northern Scots Presbyterians*, when in the whole Narrative there is not the least expression that favours of such a Design. Neither does any such Thing appear to me by the three Instances couched in that Argument. For first, for Mr. Osburn, tho the Character fixt upon him may seem ungrateful, yet it being appropriated individually to himself, and with a decent Commendation of the seven Nonconforming Ministers, who are specially excepted from the Charge, is very far from carrying the Mark of a mortal Prejudice against the Body of the Scots Presbyterians; to whom Mr. Walker has always been observed by his Neighbors to retain a more than ordinary kindness, even to his Prejudice. Secondly, The placing Mr. Hewson in the same Category with Mr. Osburn, is no great Solecism, since they were both Dissenters from the Church establish'd by Law, and who knew that he was cast out from the Presbyterian Communion? But to say, he is *no more a Member of Mr. Osburns Communion, than of Mr. Walkers*, is all one as to allege, that a Jew is a Protestant, because he is no Papist. Thirdly, For the not inserting the Names of the seven Nonconforming Ministers, I say again, and can make it good, that it was merely for want of Information: and its most disingenuously averr'd, that a List of their Names was put into Mr. Walkers hand, who earnestly sought for it, but could not get it. And for the Proof of this, I appeal to Captain Mac Culagh now in London (who shew'd Mr. Walker some confused Notes, but never gave him a Diary.) I appeal to Mr. Clavel
and

and the Printer, if the Narrative was not stopt a whole Day in the Press, in expectation of such an Account of their Names, which was never given in.

In Answer to the seventh, I say, it is very probable that Mr. *Walkers* innate Modesty will dispose him to give the Deference to the Actions of other Men in *London-Derry*, beside Colonel *Baker*, and to lessen himself: but in the mean time his Courage will not suffer him tamely to submit to his own Disparagement, and see his Credit wounded by so palpable Injustice. But who are these that are on *Tip-toe* to give him *Demonstration*? Is it the Lowness of their Stature obligeth them to rear themselves, that they may look in his Face? And what is the *Demonstration*? Is it at the point of the Sword? Certainly this looks like a bragging Rhodomontade, and a Challenge sent from No-body to Some-body. And I dare undertake, if Mr. *Walker* would think it fit to lay aside his *Gown*, he would not stand in Fear of any of their *Swords*. But the *Apologist* thinks he has pleas'd his Admirers, by squeezing in an unmannerly Sarcasm on the Church, when he notes Colonel *Bakers* *Civilitie* to be a *Sacred*, and significant Ceremony to the Churches Service. But this being no way incident, or pertinent to the matter, plainly shews, that while he looks on Mr. *Walker*, he squints on the Church, and obliquely throws a scorn upon it.

The Epilogue to the Arguments is utter'd very magisterially, yet seems to beg the Question, while with an hypocritical Complement to Mr. *Walkers* Integrity, it goes about to blast the Credit, and invalidate the Truth of his Narrative. In Sum (to imitate the Author in his florid expressions) that Pamphlet bears no more Resemblance to an *Apology*, than a virulent Satyr does to a civil Panegyric, or than John *Presbyter* does to John *Baptist*. In the mean Time he tickles himself with unapplicable Metaphors of *Attagues*, *Cessation of Arms*, *giving Battle*, and *Blockades*; upon which I shall animadvert, so soon as I can understand, to what Purpose they are urged.

And

And now the witty Man begins to conjure up some Spirits, on purpose that he may shew his Art in laying them; he dextrously plays the Part of Plaintiff and Defendant; he invents Objections according to his Fancy, that so he may Answer them according to his Pleasure. But while with a Rhetorical Quickness, peculiar only to the Writer, he makes a subtile Distinction between the *Governor of Derry*, and the *Rector of Donagh-more*; between his *Martial Capacity*, and his *Ecclesiastical*; between his *Command over his Inferiors*, and his *Submission to his Superiors*; his *Action for the King and Queen*, and his *Obedience to his Governors*; he notoriously discovers a Design to vilifie the *Bishops*, and affront the *Church of England*, of which if Mr. Walker had not been a Member, and a Minister; he had escaped those dry Jeers and unhandson Reflections, which are scattered in every Page of that Pamphlet; and in stead thereof had been congratulated with the Honour and Applause justly due to him for his un-paralleld good Service. For it is to be observed, how with a side-wind he blasts the *Hierarchy*, obtruding this crude Notion, That *it will be found the Interest of both Church and State, to repeal the Act of Scandalum Magnatum, as it respects that Order*, that is to say, to abolish *Episcopacy*, and seclude them from the House of Lords. In the mean Time in the Liberty of his Fancy, he intimates, That a very Reverend Prelate from Ireland went as far as *Barnet*, to meet Col. Walker, received him into his own Coach, and conducted him to London. But I can assure you (for I saw it) that he was met at *Barnet* by Sir Robert Cotton, received in his Coach, and conducted in it to London: so that if Sir Robert Cotton be an Archbishop, he carries a Cloak over his Pall, and stands in Need of a Dispensation for his Lay-Habit. But since he makes such Mistakes in Matters wholly circumstantial, we may guess at his Sincerity in Things of moment.

He goes on, and labouring between the Objection and the Answer, he enters into a Theological Disquisition upon

B

Episcopal

Episcopal Commands, and Pastoral Obedience; but all along sticks to the Point, to under-value Mr. Walker, and represent him as an in-animate Tool moved by the hand of another, and yielding implicit Obedience to the Dictates of his Superiors. Good Sir, do me the Favour to tell me, do you think Mr. Walker was the Compiler of that Narrative, which passes under his Name, or not? If you do not (as in the former part of your Paper you seem to insinuate) why do you calumniate him for the Errors, and Imperfections in it? If you do, why do you dart such unkind Reflections upon a Man of Sense and Courage; and expose him as a tame dull Animal, that cannot move, but as he is actuated by his Superiour? Hitherto I took you for an original Historiographer; now I find you to be a Retailer of News; and I cannot but wonder that a Person of your precise Sincerity, should positively assert such a Mistake, in setting down the *Bishops Discourse*, and Mr. Irwyns smart Repartee, as precedaneous to the *locking of Derry-Gates*; when it is most certainly true, that the Gates were shut *about Noon*, and that Passage did not happen, *till the Evening*, after the Gates were shut, the Irish kept out, and it was too late to ask the Bishops Advice. As for the *Resolution, Gallantry, and inestimable serviceableness of Mr. Irwyn*, I should pass it over; but that so partial an Ascription of so memorable an Action intirely to him, doth unkindly derogate from the Merits of others, who were equally forward, and as eminently concern'd in the Transaction: for besides several young Men who appear'd in it, some of the Aldermen, and graver Citizens secretly animated and directed the younger sort to the Enterprize, but were not openly seen in it, that they might act the more securely under the Umbrage of the Rabbles. I do agree with the Apologist, that without that Action, the *following Gallantry display'd on that Stage* had never had a Foundation or Being (for the Protestants could not have kept the City at last, if the Papists had not been kept out at first.) But to say, that Mr. Walker was not *sui Juris*, be-

because he did not attribute the sole Honour of that Enterprize to Mr. *Irwyn* (when very civilly and candidly he celebrates the Briskness and Readiness of the younger sort, in the twelfth page of his Narrative) is a very churlish, and injurious Reflection upon him, who deserved better at all our Hands. And let me tell you, if Mr. *Walker* had not been *sui juris*, and inclined to conceal the worst, he would have noted the *Resolution, Gallantry, and in-estimable Serviceableness* of this young Man, in deserting *London-Derry*, when he, with many others, stay'd in it.

It is true, the *Bishop* did thereupon leave the City, being not able to influence the Citizens with his *Doctrin*: but what then? Why so many Words, and so much Notice taken of this single Action? It is not only and principally to asperse the *Bishop*, but to cast more Dirt upon Mr. *Walker*, taxing him implicitly with a deliberate Partiality, because in his Narrative he did not divulge this Passage, but threw a Mantle upon the Nakedness of his Ghostly Father. But by this Time I have found the *Apologist* to be a very ill-humored Man, by short Hints fomenting a Difference, and suggesting Distinctions between the *Church of England*, and the *Dissenters*: but moderate and good Men of all Perswasions will condemn such a giddy and un-temper'd Zeal; and to their Wisdom I assent. But what! Could he find never a Text in Scripture pat to the Purpose, but he must sully the Cleanliness of his *Apology* by a prophane Heathen Poet? But it is a far-fetcht Allusion: and as justly, and as partly I may retort from Verses of the same Author.

O Proceres, Censore opus est, an Haruspice Novis?

Scilicet horreves, majoraque Monstra putares,

Gi. Mulier Vitulum, vel si Bos ederet Agnum. Juven. Sat. 2.

Without Passion, I do soberly and seriously protest, I have not of late seen a more confused Huddle of Detraction, and spiteful Invectives, than I have met in this *Apology in Masquerade*; and so I leave the Author to hug himself with the Content he takes in it.

But now the Scene must be shifted. *Exit Apologist*, and enter *Casnist*. And here indeed he shews some Symptoms of good Nature, in not ingrossing wholly to himself the Fa-

culity of doubting, and resolving, but affording a Liberty to others to offer Answers to his Queries. And to the first I say, and I speak it on my certain Knowledge, that the English in *Ulster*, and in the other Provinces of *Ireland*, conceived much Joy and Comfort, that so many Protestants of the *Scotch Nation* were planted in the *North* (tho the Writer of the Pamphlet must take shelter under the Printer, to excuse the addition of a Cipher to his Muster-Roll, when he reckons their Number to be *Ten hundred thousand*) they look'd upon them as their Out-Guard, and assured Auxiliaries against Popish Attempts, and sudden Massacres. But to suppose, that the *Westminster Ecclesiastic Club* (by which I know not what he can mean, unless he antedate a scornful Reflection upon the Convocation) or *Committee for the Church of Ireland*, should be *Solicitously apprehensive of the great Figure made by the Northern Scots*; as it bewrays a Humor too too National; so it revives a discrimination between Protestant-Brethren, and Fellow-Subjects; and insinuates a secret Jealousie between the two Nations. The same disingenuous Design is hinted in the other part of the Query, by a partial application of the extraordinary Services performed by those few *Eniskillen-men*, and those in the *Garrison of Derry*, to those only of that Nation; when it is notorious, that the *Garrison of Eniskillen* was compounded for the most part of *Conaght*, and *Cavan Men*; and that in *London-Derry*, of such as came from *Tyrone*, *Ardmagh*, and *Antrim*, and of what Nation, or Perswasion they were, I appeal to all that were concerned in those Places.

Comparisons are Odious: The next Query implies a fullen Supposition, and very unseasonable, that the Followers of *Prelacy* are far inferior in number to those who abet *Presbytery*; that in that great *Northern Body* (of Scots Presbyterians) scarce the Tith would fall to the Church of *Englands* share. What does the Man mean? Would he have us believe,

lieve, that the Presbyterian Perswasion is the Logical Property of a Scotch-man? That *Presbyter* and *Scot* are Terms convertible? This is a great Fallacy: For it is very well known, that among the Northern Scots, the Nobility, Gentry, and thousands of the People (not of the meanest Rank) are true Sons, and Professors of the Church established by Law.

The third Query is a dark Riddle to me; I cannot guess what he means, nor whom he means; but if he be sure that any Person was so rash and so uncharitable (which for my part I do very much doubt) to utter such an Expression, let the *Casuiſt* call him to account for it, and be sure to describe him plainly in the much expected Narrative. And though Mr. *Walker*, when he brought the Colonel to *London*, did not leave the Parson at *Donogh-more*, yet he had left the Parson in *London*, and carried the Colonel to *Hampton-Court*, if he had followed the Advice of some Men, who would have had him appear before the King in a Soldiers Habit, and lay aside his Gown. But why this unkind Distinction between Mr. *Walker* and Colonel *Walker*? it looks like the old Sophism, when a Difference was made between the King's *Personal* and *Politick* Capacity; and men conscientiously fought for King *Charles* against their *Sovereign*.

I wish I were able to satisfy the Curiosity of the Gentleman in the fourth Query, and to discover the *Counsels and Instruments that retarded the saving or reducing of Ireland*; assuredly I would do it without Fear or Favour. But let us have a care, perhaps while he so generously absolves our gracious *Sovereign*, the *Dissenters*, and the *City of London*, from that ugly Imputation, he does tacitly and maliciously intend the Guilt and Odium of it to the Church of *England*; not this Party, not that Body, ergo it is the other: I confess I do suspect his Candor in this, because I see so little sign of it in the rest.

I do

I do agree with the Casuist in the Resolution of the fifth Query, *That the Baffles given to the Relief sent to Derry by Colonel Coningham, &c. might probably proceed from the same Spring, with the delays mentioned in the next preceeding Paragraph;* I intend to be no Advocate for them, let them answer for themselves. If the Story of *Kilmore Boom* be a Romance, it was a most unfortunate Fiction for the poor Protestants, who perished in *London-Derry* by the disappointment of their Relief; but I am apt to think, that he who has termed it so, never went so near it as to try the Reality of the thing; and therefore I must suspend my Belief of the matter, till I receive a more satisfactory Conviction, than such a conjectural Information can afford.

The sixth Query is pregnant with a most malicious, groundless, causeless Cavil: In all the Expeditions for *Ireland*, was there ever any Exception made of *Dissenters*? Was it at any time made use of as a mark to *Incapacitate* them for *Employments*? Have they not had an equal opportunity with others to embark in that cause, to *perform Services which may intitle them to Favour and Reward, according to their respective Merits*? For shame retract this injurious Calumny, and in the next Edition let it not be mentioned.

It is a great Pity, that, to prevent the necessity of the seventh Query, the Privy Council of *England* were not better advised. For at the beginning of the late Revolution (when our King was a Stranger to the Affairs of the Kingdoms) how easily might they have prevailed with Him to put Arms in the Hands of the Forward and Trusty *Dissenters* (excluding other Protestant Subjects) who would infallibly and effectually have prevented the late King James his arrival in *Ireland*, saved or retrieved that Kingdom, and prevented or crushed the Rebellion in *Scotland*, and the execrable Plot in *Edinburgh*, whose Origen the Author has traced, and believes, because he does not doubt, that it lyes near *Westminster*; to that Mystical Conjecture I have nothing to say.

But

But he plainly intimates in his Query, that if the Dissenters had been entrusted with the Conduct, or employed in the Service of the Fleet, they had at least guarded the *British Seas*, if not given account of the *French Fleet*. Which is as much as to say, if the chief Ministers of State had counselled the King to give the Conduct of the Navy to some Zealous *Tarpanlin*, instead of such an unskilful Novice as the Earl of *Torrington*, mighty things had been done (and by the way, it is a merciful Omission in the Casuist, that he has not censured the King for making that Renowned Person Admiral *Herbert* an Earl, when he implies that he did no Service.) I must crave leave to propose one Query to the Questionist: Whether he does not take Major General *Ludlow* to be a Dissenter? Whether he did not tacitly glance at him to have the chief Conduct of the Army or Navy, if the Parliament had not unluckily addressed to the King for his Apprehension? As it has been reported to be the declared Opinion of the Author.

The eighth Question is compounded of several small Queries, and I must answer them in order. I do gladly believe the Dissenting Protestants to be very Faithful and affectionate to the King, and that it would mightily advance the King's Felicity, if all other His Subjects were so; and such as are not so, shall never pass in my opinion for Protestants, but disguised Papists or Atheists. Whether under such an Administration, as the Casuist designs, all Papists and other disaffected Persons had before this been removed from Kingdom, Camp, and His Majesties Service, I cannot Divine: Neither if it had been so, have I any reason to murmur. I never was so Jealous of the Dissenters, as to make an Inquisition, whether any one of them can be taxed with Disloyalty; may they ever continue stedfast in their Allegiance, and may all others that are not so, be exploded and proscribed. If the Casuist mean those Fifty thousand or a Hundred thousand men (at the Head of whom General *Schomberg* might have performed

formed such wonderful Exploits) to consist wholly of *Dissenters*, as by the Connexion of his Discourse it seems to be intended; it was a sad Over-sight in *His Majesty*, and an unexcusable Error in the *Ministers of State* and the *Privy Council* (nay in the *Parliament* too, the Grand Council of the Kingdom) that such effectual means were not used; but what is past cannot be prevented, let us look better to our Business for the time to come.

It seems, by the ninth Query, that there is a Church-History of *Ireland* ready for the Press, and the Subscriptions of Gentlemen are demanded to it; for he desires to know, *what they will advance toward the Printing*. I cannot tell who may be the Compilers of it, but this I dare boldly say, That if it be committed to the Care of the *Apologist* and his *Club*, it will misinform the present Age, and abuse Posterity. As he proceeds, he throws off the Humour of a *Questionist*, and positively declares his Thoughts, but after such a Rate, as was not to be expected in this Juncture. Little did I think ever to see the Spirit of *William Prynne* revived, or that in these days the Function and Persons of the *Bishops* should be thus Scurrilously reviled. This Language might have pass'd under the Dominion of the Rump, but I did never imagine, that the King's Indulgence should be stretched to such a Licentiousness, in Arraiguing the whole Order, and casting Dirt on that Government which is established by Law. When he taxeth the three *Arch-bishops* now living, with their zealous *Esposal and Advance of the York Interest*, and thereby of the *Irish* Catholicks; I thought verily he had meant the Arch-Bishop of *Toledo*, the Arch-bishop of *Paris*, and the Arch-bishop of *Rouen*, and so I was much of his mind; but reading the Paragraph through, I find it to be a List of Articles promoted against the Bishops, and especially three of the *Arch-bishops now living amongst us*, whom, beside their Adherence to the *York Interest*, and the *Irish* Catholicks, he asperseth with a
very

very preposterous Charity, in conferring Livings and Dignities for the Merit of *Railing against Fanaticks*; with great insincerity, in *Affronting and Silencing their own Clergy for preaching against the Papists*; with the ignominious Quality of *Informers*, and exposing the *Dissenters to Shame, Persecution and Misery*: Than which no more opprobrious Characters could be branded on that reverend Tribe, of whom some lately stood in the Gap, and stoutly stemmed the Torrent of Popery, with the Martyrdom of their Liberty, and the Hazard of their Lives: But it would give too much Reputation to the Calumny, to labour for an Apology: And until the Accuser shall think it fit to specify particular Persons and Actions, I am not able to Prognosticate a Reply. I pass over his ingenious Flurt upon the two *Irish Archbishops*, and his Jeer of *Verbum Sacerdotis*, because I cannot comprehend the Sense or Application of it. But for what he suggests concerning the *Arch-bishop of Dublin*, it is a positive Falshood; for the Commissioners for distributing the Charity have been interrogated on this occasion, and the Books search'd, and it appears evidently, that he has not received so much as one Penny out of the *publick Fund of Charity to the Distressed Protestants of Ireland*: And because I find him so notoriously tripping in the truth of that, I do much suspect the other part of his Averment, that the *Arch-bishop has ten thousand pound here in Bank*; but for the Arch-bishop's sake, I heartily wish the Informer were not mistaken in his Calculation.

The malicious *Querent*, in his last Section, is not content directly to undervalue Mr. *Walker*, by exposing him as an easie Thing under the Empire of other Men, but forceth in oblique Reflections and Abuses on the *Bishops, and the Church of England*; he chargeth him in the Front, and attacks the other on the Flank, with Squibs, Noyse, and no Wounds. Indeed for taking of abrupt and in-coherent Periods, our *Casnist* goes beyond any Man, and in this last

Essay he has fully demonstrated his Art. And but that he
owns himself to be of the *Presbyterian* Persuasion (whose
Discretion and Moderation recommends them beyond all
sorts of *Non-conformists*; and their Dissent from the Church
of England being grounded upon Matters of no great Im-
portance, we hope for their Return; and speedy Re-union
with us) I should suppose him to be a Disciple of *William*
Pem, or *Ignatius Loyola*: for who else would so unhan-
somly give at the Consecration of Church-men, their *two or three*
years Pre-meditation for a Sermon, their boasting, of infinite
Service done to the State, and their Endeavours to prescribe
new methods of hampering the *Fanaticks*? who else would pro-
claim the Odium the Clergy of England have incurred from all
Protestants abroad, and the Ingratitude of some of the Bishops,
who boggle at some things out of meer Impulse of Con-
science (which on the other side is wont to be a sufficient
Plea). If I had a mind to play the Satyrist, and to reori-
tinate a Party, it would be no difficult Task to wipe off
such Aspersions, by turning the end of the Prospective, and
describing the Failures and Miscarriages of another sort of
Men. But I have no Inclination to exasperate or foment a
Misunderstanding between Protestants. And because it
pleased the Divine Providence to make use of an ordinary
Person in the performance of extraordinary Actions, such as
no Age nor History can parallel; nay, though that Service
has manifestly conducted to the Safety and Rescue of the
whole Protestant Interest; yet because a *Georgian*; a
Minister of the Church of England was the Instrument; the
Caviller does not only detract from him that Honour and
Commendation; which the whole Body of Protestants
through Europe are bound to pay him; but Scurrilously
Derides and Ridicules him, in his *Delicatory Address* to the
King.

It is not worth the while, to play the Critick, else I would make a Remark upon the Simplicity of his Expression, when he speaks of a *Head* ~~dedicated~~ of Reason; in my Opinion that word cannot be applied in the *passive Sense*, for it implies a spontaneous Act; a Man may be said to *mediate*, but not properly to *be* *mediate*; (but it is a new-fashioned Word, and he had no mind to be thought ignorant of the Mode.) Neither did I tax him for saying, The Bishop had *erred* the Doctrine, p. 14. because perhaps it was the Fault of the Printer.

The Conclusion is very agreeable to the Premises. For having invidiously reflected on the Members of the established Church in *England* and *Ireland*, he now makes a Sally into *Scotland*, and would fain obtrude upon the World, that the wild Party there, which started up in Opposition to the present Government, were of the Churches best Sons, and Champions. Then in a delicate Style, with most accurate Metaphors, and un-intelligible Allegories, of Schomberg's Thumb; Dutch, Germans, and Swisses Fingers; turning up *Musket-balls*; taking of *Sauks*; the Difference between *Min-Heer* and *Monsieur*; *Mandates*; *leaden Paddarines*; and such canting Stuff; he sums up his Banter, claps his Wings, and Crows like a Cock ———.

And now I am persuaded, that as the angry Gentleman hath flown in the Face of the Government; thrown Dirt on the Bishops, and the Church establish'd by Law: so he hath not in the least obliged either that Nation, or that Party, whom he Flatters with such Eloges. For the Gentlemen of the Scots, being generally Masters of good Breeding, will not approve of such National, and partial Applications; the Dissenters (especially the Presbyterians, who desire that their Moderation may be known to all Men) will give him no Thanks, for blowing the Coals of Division when the Eyes of all good Men are set towards Peace and Union,

Union, and their Withers tend to a perfect cementing of all Protestants into one Body, as they remain impenetrable against the open Attacks, and secret Machinations of our treacherous and implacable Enemies abroad and at home.

And so I leave him to his Religion, who (as his Honour in Order, when he saw, that his Counsel would not prevail, will not mind me I refer it to God's Judgment)

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

Class was taken a distance of 8 1/2 miles. The Government, with the aid of the United States Army, was able to take the city of the United States.

~~_____~~

... ..

And now I am reminded, through the many Com-

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

...and the ...

The first step in the process of creating a new product is to identify a market need. This involves conducting market research to determine what consumers want and are willing to pay for. Once a market need has been identified, the next step is to develop a concept or prototype of the product. This stage often involves collaboration between designers, engineers, and marketers to ensure that the product meets both functional and aesthetic requirements.

RECEIVED

